

Participating in the Political Process

by

LÉON DION

*Public participation in the political process is as important to the health of a liberal democracy as representation, but until recently its many forms, apart from the act of voting, have received scant attention. There are now encouraging signs of change.**

WESTERN liberal political philosophers have made little effort to develop a theory of political participation. There is general agreement that active political involvement is necessary for the full development of man as a citizen; that it permits the functioning of intermediary organizations between individuals and government which are indispensable for the smooth operation of the political system; and, finally, that it is a necessary condition for effective control of policy-makers. These views, however, have been allowed to remain undeveloped. Instead, the energy of those theorists has been spent on exploring the idea of representation. Reversing the value order erected by the classical Greeks and by modern thinkers such as Rousseau, liberal philosophers have advanced the view that democracy rests first on representation and, because of geographical, demographic or other such practical considerations, only secondarily on participation.

John Stuart Mill exemplifies perfectly this kind of orientation:

It is evident, [he wrote in *Considerations on Representative Government*.] that the only government which can fully satisfy all the exigencies of the social state is one in which the whole people participate; that any participation, even the smallest public function, is useful; that the participation should everywhere be as great as the general degree of improve-

* Dunning Trust Lecture. Queen's University, February 14, 1968.

ment of the community will allow; and that nothing less can be ultimately desirable than the admission of all to a share in the sovereign power of the State. But since all cannot, in a community exceeding a single small town, participate personally in any but some very minor portions of the public business, it follows that the ideal type of a perfect government must be representative.¹

Apart from the act of voting at the polls, which, since the advent of universal suffrage, has been the object of a good deal of concern, political participation has been taken for granted, or it has been considered with outright suspicion. Theorists have stressed the fact that not all kinds of participation are equally valuable and that a high rate of participation may be an indication of political stress or may result from compulsion. Therefore, there has been little attempt made to improve upon existing mechanisms of participation or to devise new mechanisms. In good *laissez-faire* fashion, it was apparently assumed that optimum participation would automatically result from the absence of interference with individual motivations to participate. Indeed, Western liberal political institutions have evolved in a shape more or less consciously designed to discourage direct personal involvement in the political process.

By contrast, Communist philosophy, while virtually bypassing the question of representation, has laid stress on the need for personal and group participation in collective affairs. Only through the active collaboration of everyone in all sectors of activities will there be a complete realization of human potentialities, thereby making possible the future leap into the period of higher communism. Furthermore, on this question practice is consistent with doctrine. There is incessant involvement in systematic adjustments of existing forms of participation and constant experimentation with new forms; responsible agitators, teachers and leaders unceasingly endeavour to stimulate general participation in the various cadres.

It is a noteworthy fact, however, that in most liberal countries, there have recently been signs of a change of view. Scholars and politicians alike have become increasingly aware of the need for serious adjustments in the forms and qualities of participation under the impact of industrialization, welfare policies and mass culture. Naïve

and ill-inspired as it may sometimes be, the search by Western specialists in Communist countries, notably Yugoslavia, for models which might inspire liberal democracies is one manifestation of this new awareness of the increasing importance of participation. A more promising manifestation is the recent increase of interest in the forms of participation as they exist within the Western societies themselves. Theorists are progressively abandoning the long-held view that deficiencies in participation can be compensated for by improvements in representative devices. It is more and more realized that participation is one of the twin pillars of democracy and that, where it is seriously deficient, democracy will not thrive.

Thanks mainly to the efforts of behaviourists, our knowledge of the extent of actual political participation within individual countries and across differing political systems has greatly increased in recent years. One shortcoming of such studies, however, has been their limitation for the most part to electoral data. This orientation is largely due to the fact that electoral behaviour as compared to other kinds of behaviours, is of easy access and most amenable to quantitative analysis, but there may also be a tendency, characteristic of "traditionalist" or "institutionalist" scholars, to consider any of the less formal means of participation as irrelevant if not obnoxious. Thus even recent studies on political participation have tended to ignore such important phenomena as public opinion, pressure groups and advisory committees. Another limitation of many studies on participation is the failure to recognize the circuitous character of most participation by citizens² A great deal of political participation actually takes place indirectly through the activities of individuals and groups within social organizations and its significance for the people concerned becomes apparent only when considered in the light of their daily interests and aspirations.

It is not easy, therefore, accurately to assess and evaluate the state of political participation that exists in liberal democratic societies to-day, and one must deplore the tendency on the part of many thinkers to pronounce judgement without full cognizance of the whole situation, and, on that basis, to propose sweeping reforms. One prerequisite to any sensible position is a careful assessment of the true

dimensions of political participation. This will make it possible, then, to formulate a reasoned judgement on the existing situation and to indicate some promising orientations for reforms.

Dimensions of Political Participation

It is commonplace to say that pluralism is a central characteristic of modern liberal society. It is surprising, therefore, to find that students of political participation often overlook this trait and restrict their investigations to the more formal and manifest categories of participatory behaviour, such as voting at the polls or activities closely related to voting.³ Yet, to be in a position properly to assess the dimensions of participation, we must surely recognize the manifold character of the phenomenon and take into account all the relevant components of the political process, not merely its most obvious manifestations.

One can suggest many varieties of political participation which are available to individuals:

- Exposing oneself to political stimuli.
- Engaging in discussions on public issues with relatives, friends or workmates.
- Trying to influence through speech, writing or activities within primary or secondary organizations the moulding of local or national public opinion on political issues.
- Being a member of an interest group which engages more or less frequently in activities of pressure politics.
- Being personally involved in lobbying activities with legislators or administrators.
- Sitting on an advisory committee appointed to advise on political or administrative decision-making.
- Voting at the polls in order to express one's preference regarding candidates, parties and programmes.
- Participating in one or more ways in electoral campaigns.
- Being an officer, an active member, a sympathizer or a more or less neutral observer of a political party.
- Being a candidate for political office.
- Holding non-elective or elective public office.

It can be seen from this list which could probably be enlarged, that forms of political participation are far more numerous than is often supposed. Although such a list is useful because it reveals the

full breadth of the dimensions of political participation, certainly an analytical categorization would be preferable. Any differentiation of levels of participation within the political system is likely to be unsatisfactory. However, in the preceding list, four different levels of political participation are clearly recognizable: the level of participation in the political culture (institutional stimuli, values, attitudes and opinions) which covers our first three varieties; the level of participation in activities relating to pressure politics (interest groups and lobbying); the level of participation within consultative bodies (advisory committees) and, finally, the level of participation related to representative devices (voting, electoral activities, partisan roles, candidatures, public roles).

It is not possible here to comment at length upon the merits of our fourfold differentiation of political participation. It will suffice to note that, so far, studies have concentrated on the fourth level, that is the more formal and classical level of representative participation. Very little is known concerning the various participatory behaviours in the other three levels. True, such phenomena as public opinion, pressure groups and advisory committees have been the focus of many specialized studies, but rarely if ever have they been considered from the angle of their function as channels of political participation open to individuals.

We come now to a very different question which must be raised before trying to assess the scope and vitality of political participation in liberal societies. It relates to the propensity of various categories of individuals to engage in active political participation. Data on this important subject are rapidly accumulating, but we urgently need a theoretical model, from which we could work, in order to classify the variables which influence the degree of political participation. Since those variables stem from the social system it seems indicated, in principle at least, that we must clarify how they distribute themselves along the various levels of the social system.⁵

Assuming that the social system consists of six different levels which are: ecology, demography, technology, socio-economic stratification, culture and politics, the important variables of political participation distribute themselves in the following manner:

- 1) *At the ecological level*: dimension of locality (whether large city, small city or country). Other variables at that first level might be climate and physical geography.
- 2) *At the demographical level*: ethnicity, sex, age, marital status.
- 3) *At the technological level*: communication media which make possible the dissemination of information and expertise; standard of life, leisure; quality and stability of interpersonal and group relationships.
- 4) *At the level of socio-economic stratification*: personal predispositions and life experience; family; social class (as determined by occupation, income and education): professional class, middle class, skilled workers, unskilled workers and laborers, farmers; voluntary associations and interest groups.
- 5) *At the cultural level*: social culture: ideologies and movements.
- 6) *At the political level*: electoral regime, party system; legislative, administrative and governmental institutions; political culture: ideologies and movements.

From the viewpoint of political science, the social system presents itself as being animated by two different dynamics, the first, which I term the social dynamic, covers the first five levels; the second, which I call the political dynamic, applies to the sixth level. This point is important since, in the last analysis, any theory of political participation is based upon a conception of the relationships between society and government. Indeed, a number of forms of participation emanate from needs and aspirations created by the interplay of the two dynamics. Pressure groups, for example, have come into existence as a result of experience gained in voluntary associations, as well as from certain conditions in the political system itself. In the area of public opinion much depends upon the mass communication network as well as on the political conditions and culture. And, finally, advisory committees function as mechanisms for harmonizing, in complex and problematical circumstances, divergent group interests and public policies. None of these three central forms of political participation can be seen exclusively either in terms of the social dynamic or of the political dynamic. Rather are they products of the intermingling and overlapping of the two.

Unfortunately Western scholars find this kind of situation especially difficult to grasp. They are still prisoners of the old laissez-

faire illusion of a sharp separation between the social and the political sectors of society. This state of mind explains why they tend to ignore in their investigations those mixed forms of participation.

Another similar illusion which is still entertained in liberal circles is that political participation depends only on individual motivations. Hence we find a loud insistence upon the individual citizen and the sublimation of his role. Hence also springs the gratuitous assumption underlying liberal political philosophy that the essential and the only legitimate political relationship between the individual and the government ensues from their immediate confrontation one with the other.

Recent developments in technology and social communications have brought into predominance the complex interweaving of action and reaction between the social and the political dynamics, and have made us unwilling to accept this simplistic approach any longer. Indeed, behavioural studies show that most factors of political participation, even of such an apparently eminent individual behaviour as voting at the polls, are grounded in groups and are a function of a given social structure. As I have indicated above, the propensity of one to participate depends upon one's place of living, one's personal status, one's position in the social stratification, and so on. This is why all proposals for reforming political participation which are aimed at individuals only are doomed to failure. One must at the same time try to modify the social and political conditions which influence the factors of political participation as well as the nature of their action on individuals. One might also look for new forms of participation which might stimulate apathetic citizens and induce them to participate.

If the forms of political participation are numerous—indeed far more numerous than is usually thought—it does not follow, however, that individuals take full advantage of the many opportunities given them for participation. Research has shown that political participation is a cumulative phenomenon. In general, those who are more involved in one form of participation will tend to be more involved in other forms as well. Research has also shown that, except for such simple acts as voting, it is restricted to a very few individuals who occupy well-defined privileged positions. Participation will vary from a maxi-

imum for individuals who live in large cities, are white, male, between 35 and 60 years of age and married, who have ready access to media of information and enjoy some leisure, who are from higher social status family background in terms of occupation, income and education, and occupy a similar status themselves, to a minimum for individuals who live in the country and are engaged in non-specialized farming, who are negroes, female, either very young or very old and single, who have little access to the media of information and do not have any leisure, who are from low social status family background and themselves occupy a similar socio-economic position. Of course, the personal and social characteristics of individuals are rarely so well defined and, in practice, there will be a degree of interference or mixing up among participatory factors which will blur the situation to some extent. But the aggregate weight of factors will always lean on the side of higher or lower participation.

The factors mentioned above are not, of course, equally important. Ethnic background, education, income and occupation, will weigh more heavily than age, marital status and perhaps sex. Furthermore many factors will overlap, e.g. persons of higher education, occupation and income will tend to live in large cities. It would be impossible to isolate completely the relative impact of occupation, income and education considered separately. Another important phenomenon is the very rapid decline in the rate of participation as we leave the most privileged and descend along the scale to mixed and to poor conditions.

The final question to be considered concerns the intensity of political participation, that is the degree of personal involvement in political activities. This is an almost unexplored dimension of participation, with the only basis for evaluation so far being the subjective judgement of the individuals concerned.⁶ Insofar as we can judge with the crude indices at our disposal, intensity of participation is a function of personal interest in politics, and we know that this interest depends on such factors as accessibility of information and sense of efficacy.⁷ The data at our disposal show that very few people—perhaps 10% of the population—are very much interested in politics, while about 50% manifest a casual interest, and the rest show no interest at all.⁸

With the exclusion of voting at the polls and similar simple activities, political participation then must be considered a quasi-professional activity. Depending on the criteria of evaluation used in different studies, even in such a developed country as the United States, the percentage of the population which can be considered very active will vary from 10 to 15%. Another 10 to 15% will be rated as active, and the remaining 70 to 80% inactive⁹). In other Western countries the proportion of active participants is much lower—probably more so than is generally assumed¹⁰. Relative differences from country to country are due to the way in which differences in social systems influence the variables of political participation. Particularly relevant are differences in systems of stratification and the way in which individuals are distributed along the various strata; differences in the social and political institutions which are provided and in the way they function; differences in the roles which the social and political cultures permit for various categories of individuals; and, less tangible but nonetheless important, differences in personal character as a consequence of national or ethnic traits.

A Normative Approach to Political Participation

It is not the role of positive thinkers to pronounce value judgments in their findings. Accordingly political behaviourists in general are satisfied with uncovering the facts about one or another facet of participation. At any rate we cannot expect from them a moral evaluation of the situation or elaborate proposals for reforms. We must turn to philosophers if we want a normative appraisal of the facts, but in the case of our present subject, the literature available, especially in the English language, is disappointing. True, there exist a number of broad appraisals, offering programmes for reforms which are often inspired by non-liberal models, but there are few systematic philosophical studies of political participation drawn from Western liberal experience and directed at bringing about any renovation of our views concerning democracy.

This represents a serious gap in our thinking. I am convinced that nothing less than the elevation of the notion of participation to

the rank of a first concept of democracy is needed in order to grasp the true significance of the faults in the present situation and to allow the corrective potentialities in our social system to develop to the full. Liberal thinkers may formally acknowledge the eminent position of political participation as a value and as a concept, but they have failed to give that notion the kind of practical recognition which is required if we wish political democracy to retain some concrete meaning for the ordinary citizen of to-day and to-morrow.

The moment participation is used as an analytical concept it becomes impossible to remain indifferent to the world of inequalities which unfolds before us. We soon come up against the fact that the differences in opportunities for political participation simply reflect the inequalities of economic and social conditions, and we begin to wonder whether participation mechanisms do not in fact accentuate social inequality. Perhaps we will find that liberal democracy is neither able nor willing to leave behind the formalism which from the start was a characteristic of its advocacy of individual liberty and equality. At any rate, in all decency, we cannot disregard the dire fact that seventy to eighty per cent of our citizens do not for all practical purpose take any active part in the political process where some of the most important decisions concerning their daily lives are taken.

The first question is: have we any hope of establishing some kind of equality of participation in decision-making for people who are, in the first place, made so fundamentally unequal by the functioning of the social system? My answer is that we must of necessity at least try to proceed in that direction. The second question then is: what is the scope of the work that lies before us?

In my view, as a first step, we need a full synthesis of the accumulated knowledge which is at present disseminated throughout participation surveys, studies of organizations, reports on planning and development projects, works on voluntary organizations, elections, political parties, public opinion, pressure groups, advisory committees, and so forth. This synthesis, from its inception, should be orientated to its ultimate use and thus should bring to light the more or less explicitly formulated values which underlie the legitimation and func-

tioning of the various participation mechanisms—values related to central notions such as legitimacy, public interest, pluralism, representations, delegation, majority rule, responsibility and self-determination.

Such a synthesis should be mindful of the sociological dimension of political participation. It is worth mentioning at this point that the main forms of political participation in liberal democracies were invented before the advent of industrial technology and the development of the welfare state. One can then—indeed one must—raise the question whether those forms are adequate to the tasks they are called upon to perform under present-day conditions. The future of political participation is necessarily affected by industrial conditions. The more the world of technology imposes itself, the greater the power of society over things and men and the more urgent the need for adequate mechanisms for the protection of free men and the translation of their needs and aspirations into public policies.

Any welfare state is first and foremost an organizational state. More and more the scope of its activities encompasses the full range of men's daily lives. This means that absence of real participation in the political process is now far more of a deprivation than it was in the past when the state operated at the outside margins of social life. The very success of the welfare state has produced a kind of created harmony resting on the apparent rationality and ineluctability of decisions taken about highly complex questions. That condition of "created harmony" in turn encourages political apathy on the part of ordinary citizens. The result of all this is that, perhaps without realizing it, we have actually come a long way toward the development of "vertical" democracy, that is of a regime which rests on the rule of oligarchies throughout the range of social and political hierarchies. It may be true, as Gunnar Myrdal has indicated, that there has occurred at the same time a qualitative and quantitative increase of individual involvement in social affairs through non-political devices such as cooperatives and unions, which has diminished the need for state intervention in certain spheres of activity and thus rendered traditional forms of participation less incongruous.¹¹ Nevertheless, one must acknowledge that the weight of all factors taken together leans rather

in the direction of further increase of governmental activities until it threaten to become overpowering. Thus it is important that we search without ceasing for ways of increasing and intensifying direct political participation. Unless appropriate means for redress are applied, this state of affairs may deteriorate even further in the future.

In addition to taking into account the sociological dimension of political participation the proposed synthesis will have to clarify the purpose of political participation. The question: "Why in a democracy should citizens actually take part in policy-making?" has rarely if ever been approached systematically. As I suggested at the beginning, liberal philosophers have evaded it and concentrated their efforts on the invention and legitimation of representative devices. I would suggest that the situation we have uncovered renders that kind of escape no longer morally acceptable.

The purpose of political participation in a democracy should be sought in two different directions: that of the individual and that of the political system itself.

The main assumption concerning the importance of political participation for the individual is that it permits him a degree of self-mastery over his environment. Participation is also felt to be necessary for the safeguarding of human dignity and the full realization of individual potentialities. Further it is argued that absence of participation will lead to alienation. However, while it is not necessary to argue about the intrinsic worth of mastery over one's environment and full realization of one's potentialities, we are less clear as to what constitutes a concrete formulation of these objectives, given contemporary social conditions, and their exact relationships to political participation. For example, could not self-mastery over one's own life be achieved just as well by institutional controls over the government as by personal involvement in governmental activities? Put in another way, is direct participation really a necessary condition for the existence of adequate controls? Or we might ask exactly how can political participation contribute to man's self-realization? What is the relation of political participation to one's personal needs, to social integration? How and to what extent can it meet the need to understand, to be informed, the need for power or for self-esteem?¹² The answers to

these and similar questions are necessary prerequisites for the clarification of the purpose of political participation at the level of individuals.

But there is another dimension to this question of the purpose of political participation which it will be even more important to examine. We must look into its significance for the political system itself.

Investigations conducted along that line have revealed the necessity of participation for the very existence of the organizations themselves. They have also examined the consequences that ensue from the enforcing of given regimes of participation, and explored the various inducements, incentives and other techniques which are used in order to ensure the kind of participation which will maintain optimum organizational equilibrium.¹³ The light shown by studies of organizations on the purpose of participation is the greater because they view participation as an objective element of the functioning of organizations. It is thus possible to go beyond the broad and unverifiable aims that thinkers have been too often satisfied to propose.

Keeping in mind, then, the sociological dimension of political participation and the question of the purpose of participation both for the individuals and the organizations themselves, it will be possible to approach with confidence the final problem of finding ways to increasing political participation.

Given the conditions mentioned above, one can understand why so many reformers have turned to auto-management or co-management as the only methods of participation that ensure mastery over environment and realization of self to the individual. This orientation is the more understandable since there is a respectable Western tradition for co-management formulae associated with such thinkers as Saint-Simon and successful movements such as associationism, cooperatives and work communities (*communautés de travail*).

Yet in Western liberal societies those experiments have remained confined to small sectors of activities and have never been elevated to the rank of a first principle of organization. One must turn to socialist countries, notably Yugoslavia, in order to find a social system systematically constructed according to co-management premises. This circumstance explains the widespread enthusiasm in some circles for Yugoslavian social theories and practices, especially for their

mechanisms of participation. Proposals for grafting these mechanisms on to liberal societies, however, are unacceptable because they fail to take into account the considerable difference in the social system and levels of development. In any case, just as the economic success of cooperatives has brought about a rapid decline in active participation among the membership, so has the consolidation of the socialist system in Yugoslavia reduced the willingness of individuals to take full advantage of the opportunities to participate that are given to them. Propaganda, material inducements and a certain amount of coercion are needed in order to bring about the level of general participation which is needed for the operation of their institutions.¹⁴

The search within liberal societies for co-management techniques, moreover, will lead nowhere unless attention is at the same time given to the more basic social reforms that are necessary in order to implement them. Nothing less is needed than full commitment to authoritative planning and the creation of an elaborate network of mechanisms of participation throughout the planning apparatus. Nevertheless, in spite of all the shortcomings it presents in the cases in which it was applied, co-management may perhaps be accepted as an ideal standard of participation according to which actual conditions can be appreciated.

We would be greatly misled, however, if we should limit our enquiry to the search for modes of co-management. I personally would expect far greater returns from efforts to elaborate the mechanisms of participation which have already been developed to some degree, whether by accident or design, within the Western liberal societies themselves.

The considerable importance liberal democracies have attributed to participation in elections and in political parties is justified. Similarly justified is the preoccupation with traditional popular controls over legislators, administration and government. Whatever the relative importance of each of these political institutions to-day, they singly and collectively remain basic to the democratic process as we have known it and as we wish it to be consolidated in the future.

At the same time, the lack of consideration given in many circles to less formal and newer forms of participation is regrettable — the

more so as it is possible that they contain more potentiality for real participation than the more traditional forms. If, with this end in view, we were to initiate a systematic search into the conditions of pressure-group activities, into the development of currents of public opinions and into the potentialities of advisory committees, we might bring new light to the whole question of political participation in liberal societies. An excellent example is found in the case of advisory committees. Despite widespread suspicion of them in most Western countries, they get more and more numerous and diversified every day. So far, however, they have been studied almost exclusively from the angle of their impact on administration and government. I suggest that advisory committees constitute a significant dimension of the political dynamic, and accordingly I suggest that, in referring to them, we should use a specific term such as "political consultation." Thus we can elevate the practice of consultation by committees to the rank of a positive concept of politics and in this way recognize the hope it offers for fruitful investigations on political participation.

Whilst I have formulated hypotheses and advanced broad judgements, I realize that I have given few definite answers to the questions I have raised. Indeed, I have largely confined myself to indicating the possible scope of a systematic study of political participation. Such a study would have to start from a reasoned definition of the purpose of political participation in a democratic society; then it would proceed to a rigorous assessment of the sociological dimensions of the phenomenon as well as to an elucidation of the values and objectives prerequisite to the formulation of elaborate judgements on the situation. Only then would it be possible to search for possible improvements of present forms of participation as well as possibly to invent new mechanisms. But for such an investigation to be successfully conducted, there is need for a new conception of the relationship between individuals and society and between society and government. As I have indicated, such a new conception could emerge from the perception of the functioning of the social system in terms of two dynamics, the social dynamic and the political dynamic. My hope is that I have reasonably succeeded in expressing my conviction of the importance of political participation for liberal democracies as well

as my hope that research may be intensified in that field of political science and philosophy.

NOTES

- ¹ John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty and Considerations on Representative Government*, R. B. McCalum, (ed.), Oxford, 1948, p. 151.
- ² Fred E. Katz and Fern V. Piret, "Circuitous Participation in Politics", *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. LXIX, No. 4, 1964, pp. 367-373.
- ³ One example of such an orientation is Lester W. Milbrath, *Political Participation: How and Why People get Involved in Politics*, Chicago, 1965.
- ⁴ For similar presentations see: Stein Rokkan, "The Comparative Study of Political Participation", in Austin Ranney, *Essays on the Behavioral Studies of Politics*, Urbana, 1962; Stein Rokkan, "Cross-national Studies in Political Participation", vol. XII, No. 1, 1960, pp. 7-14; Julian L. Woodward and Elmo Roper, "Political Activity of American Citizens", *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 44, Dec. 1950, pp. 972-985, reprinted in Heinz Eulau, (ed.) *Political Behavior*, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1959, pp. 133-137.
- ⁵ The main problem consists in the lack of agreement concerning categories of levels of the social system. I have tried to present categorization which will avoid any strong objections. For a list of variables of political participation, see Stein Rokkan, "Cross-national Studies in Political Participation", *International Social Science Journal*, vol. XII, No. 1, 1960, pp. 7-14.
- ⁶ We still lack the objective indices of involvement which are pre-requisite to the elaboration of an accurate scale of measurement of involvement. Alain Touraine has proposed three such indices which could perhaps be useful: 1) personal interest in participation; 2) personal identification with a group or collective interest; 3) identification with the organization's goals. Alain Touraine, *Sociologie de l'Action*, Paris, 1965, pp. 189-190.
- ⁷ In order to measure political interest I propose the following indices: 1) concern about information on public affairs; 2) attention given to political issues; 3) importance attributed to one's own intervention in political affairs; 4) motivations for acting in political matters; 5) judgement concerning the consequences of political action for one's own life. See also Morris Rosenberg, "Some Determinants of Political Apathy", *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 18 (Winter 1954), pp. 349-366, reprinted in Heinz Eulau et al., *Political Behaviour*, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-169; Robert E. Lane, *Political Life*, pp. 149-155.
- ⁸ Dayton David McKean, "Party and Pressure Politics", New York, 1949, pp. 183-194; Georges Dupeux, "L'opinion Publique et la Dépolitisation", in Georges Vedel (ed.), *La Dépolitisation, Mythe ou Réalité*, Paris, 1962, pp. 99-113.
- ⁹ See among others: Robert E. Agger and Vincent Ostrom, *Political Behavior*, The Free Press of Glencoe, III, 1959; Julian L. Woodward and Elmo Roper, "Political Activity of American Citizens", *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 44, Dec. 1950, pp. 872-885, reprinted in Eulau et al., *ibid.*
- ¹⁰ See confirmation of this view in the comparative study of Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*, Princeton, 1963.
- ¹¹ Gunnar Myrdal, *Beyond the Welfare State: Economic Planning and its International Implications*, New Haven, 1960.
- ¹² Robert E. Lane, *Political Power*, The Free Press of Glencoe, III, 1961, Chapters 8 and 9.
- ¹³ See among others: James G. March and Herbert Simon, *Organizations*, New York, 1958; Michel Crozier, *Le Phénomène Bureaucratique*, Paris, 1963.
- ¹⁴ Albert Meister, *Associations Coopératives et Groupes de Loisir en Milieu Rural*, les Editions de Minuit, Paris, 1957; Albert Meister, *Socialisme et Autogestion, L'expérience Yougoslave*, Paris, 1964; Guitha Ionescu, *L'avenir Politique de L'Europe Orientale*, Paris, 1967.